

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No. 10/712,731	Applicant(s) DICK, LYNDON SHAWN	
	Examiner Darren W. Ark	Art Unit 3643	

All Participants:

(1) Darren W. Ark.

(2) Edward M. Livingston.

Status of Application: Response to Non-Final

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 22 September 2004

Time: 11:00am EST

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Rejections of Non-Final Action mailed 6/22/04

Claims discussed:

1, 6

Prior art documents discussed:

Prior art of record applied in the rejections and also Tetzner 4,028,825

Part II.


SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

DARREN W. ARK
PRIMARY EXAMINER


(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner stated that the amendments filed 9/9/04 appear to overcome the prior art of record applied in the rejections, but the Tetzner '825 patent seems to anticipate these claims. Tetzner discloses a rod (129; see Figs. 7-9); a handle (26); a pig-tail looped hook removal end (17) which is shown in Fig. 5 as being nearly closed; and a movable bite sleeve (131, 133, 139). Examiner suggested amending claim 1 to recite that the handle has an axis which is perpendicular to the longitudinal axis of the rod and that the sleeve is freely slidable along the length of the rod such that the sleeve is capable of abutting either a surface of the handle or the spiral loop hook removal end. Tetzner's arbor (26) does not have an axis perpendicular to the long axis of the rod nor does its sleeve slide freely along the length of the rod such that the sleeve is able to abut a surface of the handle when the sleeve is positioned at the first end of the rod and able to abut the spiral looped hook removal end when the sleeve is positioned at the second end of the rod. Tetzner's sleeve (131, 133, 139) is not capable of sliding all the way such that it abuts any surface of arbor (26). Examiner also suggested amending the method claim 6 in a similar fashion and to amend the specification to provide support for these proposed features which are already represented in the Figures. Examiner also suggested amending the term "pig-tail looped hook removal end" such that the term "spiral" replaces "pig-tail" since it more clearly describes the configuration/shape of the hook removal end and since the term "pig-tail" could conceivably be a confusing term that is sometimes defined in terms of a synonym such as "braid" which is inaccurate. "Spiral" is defined as "The three-dimensional locus of a point moving parallel to and about a central axis at a constant or continuously varying distance: HELIX". Applicant agreed to the proposed changes. Please see the Examiner's Amendment for details.